arXiv:1603.02032v2 [math.CO] 8 Mar 2016

There is no $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ strongly regular graph

Jernej Azarija [a] Tilen Marc [a]

March 9, 2016

[a] Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics, Ljubljana, Slovenia
jernej.azarija@gmail.com
tilen.marc@imfm.si

Abstract

We show that there is no $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ strongly regular graph and, consequently, there is no $(96, 45, 24, 18)$ strongly regular graph, no two-graph on 96 vertices, and no partial geometry $\mathrm{pg}(5, 9, 3)$. The main idea of the result is based on the star complement technique and requires a small amount of computation.

1 Introduction

A k-regular graph of order v is said to be (v, k, λ, μ) *strongly regular* (SRG in short) if for any two distinct vertices $x, y \in V(G)$ the intersection $N(x) \cap N(y)$ has cardinality λ if x and y are adjacent and μ otherwise. While there are certain necessary conditions on v, k, λ, μ there is no general way to determine whether a (v, k, λ, μ) strongly regular graph exist for a given choice of v, k, λ and μ. For example, at the time of writing this article, the existence of a $(65, 32, 15, 16)$ SRG is not settled and is in fact the smallest case for which the existence of a SRG is not known. See Brouwer's web-page [7] for the current state of affairs on the classification of SRG's as well as [8] for the current initiative of bringing Brouwer's classification into Sage.

Given the difficulty of providing a general answer to the existence of strongly-regular graphs, many results targeting specific parameters accumulated over the years. For example, Haemers showed [12] that there is no $(76, 21, 2, 7)$ SRG while Degraer ruled out [10] the existence of a $(96, 38, 10, 18)$ SRG. The problem of determining the existence of

$(75, 32, 10, 16)$ and $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ strongly-regular graphs was given a particular significance in [11] for two reasons. On one hand, they fall into the small class of unresolved cases having less than 100 vertices. Second, the (non-)existence of $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ strongly-regular graphs determines the (non-)existence of $(96, 45, 24, 18)$ strongly regular graphs as well as of the (non-)existence of so called two-graphs on 96 vertices [11, Chapter 11]. Additional significance is given by the property that the non-existence of this graphs implies non-existence of so called partial geometry $\mathrm{pg}(5, 9, 3)$ (for the details, see [5]). Certain structural results for this graphs were obtained through the years. In particular, for a $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ SRG X it was shown by Makhnev [13] that it does not contain a 20-regular subgraph while Behbahani and Lam [3] showed that the only prime divisors of $|\mathrm{Aut}(X)|$ are $2, 3$ and 5. A recent result also showed that an independent set of X can only have cardinality 18. Indeed, if X had an independent set S of size 19, then the graph $X \setminus S$ would have been a $(76, 30, 8, 14)$ SRG (see Theorem 9.4.1 in [6]), but the non-existence of a $(76, 30, 8, 14)$ SRG was recently settled by Bondarenko, Prymak and Radchenko [4].

In [2] we showed that there is no $(75, 32, 10, 16)$ strongly-regular graph. In this paper we continue our work and use the developed approach to show the infeasibility of the parameter $(95, 40, 12, 20)$. The outline of the proof is surprisingly similar to what is presented in [2] and therefore, for the sake of brevity, we give a slightly shorter overview of the tools that we use, and refer the reader to [2] for additional references.

2 Preliminaries

In what follows X will denote a $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ strongly regular graph. The idea of our approach is based on three steps. First, we build a list of graphs $\mathcal{L}$ such that at least one member of $\mathcal{L}$ is an induced subgraph of X. In addition every graph in $\mathcal{L}$ has precisely 20 vertices and does not have 2 as an eigenvalue - we call such graphs *star complements*. In the second part we compute the so called *comparability graphs* for graphs in $\mathcal{L}$. For our purposes a comparability graph is a graph with vertex set

$$V(\mathrm{comp(H)}) = \{\mathrm{u} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathrm{n-k}} \mid \langle \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{u} \rangle = 2 \text{ and } \langle \mathrm{u}, \overrightarrow{1} \rangle = -1\},$$

and adjacency defined as

$$u \sim v \iff \langle u, v \rangle \in \{-1, 0\},$$

where A_H is the adjacency matrix of H. Finally, for every such comparability graph we show that its clique number is smaller than 75. The theory of star

complements then guarantees that X does not exist. See [9] for a general overview of the star complement technique and [14] for an application of this approach for classifying $(57, 14, 1, 4)$ SRG's.

In order to be able to build a small enough list $\mathcal{L}$ we use a well-known interlacing criterion explained in [2]. This is possible since eigenvalues of strongly-regular graphs are easy to compute: in particular, X must have eigenvalues $40, 2, -10$ of multiplicities $1, 75, 19$, respectively, see [7].

Since the interlacing criterion is by far not sufficient, we additionally need to prove certain structural results about X. This is done in the next section. Some of the lemmas that follow, rely on small Sage programs that generate certain induced structure of X. Every statement indicating that it was obtained computationally is marked in Table 1 that also lists the name of the corresponding Sage program used in the proof. All the programs and source code used in the paper can be obtained on the author's GitHub page [1].

3 Clique structure of X

The well known Hoffman's inequality [11, pp. 204] bounds the size of a independent set in a regular graph with a given least eigenvalue. In particular for our SRG X, Hoffman's bound implies that $\overline{X}$ must have maximal independent set of size 5, thus the clique number of X is at most 5. In addition, the recent bound on the number of 4-cliques of a strongly-regular graph [4] implies that the clique number of X is either 4 or 5. In this section we will show the following:

Proposition 1. *If X exists, its clique number is 5. Moreover, every 4-clique of X is contained in a 5-clique.*

Suppose that X has a 4-clique K_4 that is not contained in a 5-clique of X and let $\vec{b} = (b_0, b_1, b_2, b_3)$ be a vector where for $0 \leq i \leq 3$ we denote by b_i the number of vertices of $V(X) \setminus V(K_4)$ having precisely i neighbors in K_4. As it was explained and used in [2], a formula from [4] gives possible candidates for $\vec{b}$. In particular, in graph X it must hold $\vec{b} \in \{(3, 28, 60, 0), (1, 34, 54, 2), (2, 31, 57, 1), (0, 37, 51, 3)\}$. In the next four subsections we analyze each possibility for $\vec{b}$ showing that a $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ SRG with such a configuration does not exists.

3.1 Case $(3, 28, 60, 0)$

Let us denote with X_0, X_1, X_2 the subsets of vertices in $V(X) \setminus V(K_4)$ that have, respectively, 0, 1, 2 neighbors in K_4. Moreover, denote the vertices in X_0 by x_1, x_2, x_3.

Lemma 1. *Every vertex in X_2 has precisely two neighbors in X_0.*

Proof. Let $x_i \in X_0$. We use an argument that will be repeatedly used in this paper. Since x_i is not adjacent to any of the vertices in K_4 it has to have 20 common neighbors (since X is strongly regular with $\mu = 20$) with each vertex of K_4. Thus there are $4 \cdot 20$ paths of length 2 from x_i to K_4. On the other hand, x_i has 40 neighbors (X is 40-regular) in $X_0 \cup X_1 \cup X_2$. All the neighbors are in fact in X_2, for otherwise they could not form 80 2-paths to K_4. Since for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{i\}$ we have $|N(x_i) \cap N(x_j)| = 20$ and $|N(x_i)| = 40$, it follows

$$60 \geq |N(x_1) \cup N(x_2) \cup N(x_3)| = 3 \cdot 40 - 3 \cdot 20 + |N(x_1) \cap N(x_2) \cap N(x_3)|\,,$$

by the inclusion-exclusion principle. Thus $N(x_1) \cap N(x_2) \cap N(x_3) = \emptyset$. Therefore every vertex in X_2 is adjacent to precisely two vertices in X_0. □

For $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$ let $X_{i,j} \subseteq X_2$ be the set $N(x_i) \cap N(x_j)$. By the previous lemma, this sets are disjoint of order 20.

Lemma 2. *Each of the graphs $X[X_{1,2}], X[X_{1,3}]$ and $X[X_{2,3}]$ is a disjoint union of cycles. Moreover the graph $X[X_{1,2} \cup X_{1,3} \cup X_{2,3}]$ is 22-regular.*

Proof. Let v be a vertex of $X_{1,2}$. We count the number of 2-paths from v to K_4. Since it is adjacent to 2 vertices of it, there must be $2 \cdot 12 + 2 \cdot 20$ such paths. Denote with k the number of neighbors of v in X_2. By the previous lemma, v is adjacent to 2 vertices in X_0, thus it is adjacent to $40 - 2 - 2 - k$ vertices in X_1. Now we count 2-paths:

$$2 \cdot 12 + 2 \cdot 20 = 2k + 1(40 - 2 - 2 - k) + 0 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 3\,.$$

Therefore, v has $k = 22$ neighbors in X_2, and since it is not adjacent to x_3 it must have 20 neighbors in $X_2 - X_{1,2} = N(x_3)$. This implies that v has precisely 2 neighbors in $X_{1,2}$. □

In [13] it was shown that if graph X exists, then it does not have a 20-regular subgraph. Consider the induced subgraph on X_2 and remove the disjoint unions of cycles in $X_{1,2}, X_{1,3}, X_{2,3}$. We obtain a 20-regular subgraph and hence this configuration is impossible.

3.2 Case $(1, 34, 54, 2)$

Let X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3 be the sets of vertices having $0, 1, 2$, and 3 neighbors in K_4, respectively. In particular, let $x_0 \in X_0$ and $x_1 \neq x_2 \in X_3$.

Lemma 3. *Vertices x_1 and x_2 are not adjacent.*

Proof. Suppose $x_1 \sim x_2$. There are up to isomorphism only two possible induced graphs on $K_4 \cup \{x_1, x_2\}$. Moreover, if we add the vertex x_0 we obtain 6 candidate graphs for an induced subgraph of X. None of them interlaces X, which was checked by a Sage program listed in Table 1. □

Lemma 4. *Vertex x_0 is adjacent to both vertices in X_3. Moreover, it has 2 neighbors in X_1 and 36 neighbors in X_2.*

Proof. For the sake of contradiction, suppose x_0 is adjacent to $k \in \{0, 1\}$ vertices of X_3. Let t be the number of neighbors of x_0 in X_1. By double counting 2-paths from x_0 to K_4 we obtain:

$$4 \cdot 20 = 3k + t + 2(40 - k - t)\,,$$

which gives that $k = t$. Without loss of generality suppose that x_1 is not adjacent to x_0. By counting the number of 2-paths in a similar way we obtain that x_1 has 10 neighbors in X_2. But by strong regularity, x_0 and x_1 must have 20 common neighbors which is not possible since x_0, x_1 can share at most $k \leq 1$ common neighbors in X_1 and 10 common neighbors in X_2. Hence x_0 is adjacent to both x_1 and x_2 and so $k = t = 2$ and the claim follows. □

In virtue of Lemma 4, let x_0', x_0'' be the vertices in X_1 that are adjacent to x_0.

Lemma 5. *Each vertex x_1, x_2 has 11 neighbors in X_2.*

Proof. The lemma follows by double counting 2-paths to K_4. □

Lemma 6. *For $i = 1, 2$, the vertex x_i is adjacent to at least one of the vertices in $\{x_0', x_0''\}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 5, the vertex x_i has 11 neighbors in X_2. Since x_i is adjacent to x_0, by Lemma 4, it has 12 common neighbors with x_0. Thus it must be adjacent to at least one of x_0', x_0''. □

Let X_2^{-0} be the set of vertices in X_2 that are not adjacent to x_0. Notice that by Lemma 4, $|X_2^{-0}| = 54 - 36 = 18$.

Lemma 7. *At most one vertex from X_2^{-0} is adjacent to x_1, and at most one is adjacent to x_2.*

Proof. Vertex x_1 shares at most 2 common neighbors with x_0 in X_1 (possibly x_0' or x_0''). Thus it must have at least 10 out of 11 neighbors (Lemma 5) in X_2 adjacent to x_0. By symmetry, the same claim holds for x_2. □

Lemma 8. *Each vertex in X_2^{-0} that is not adjacent to any of the $\{x_1, x_2\}$, has degree $t \leq 2$ in $X[X_2^{-0}]$, and it has precisely t neighbors in $\{x_0', x_0''\}$. Vertices (at most two) in X_2^{-0} that are adjacent to exactly one of the vertices in $\{x_1, x_2\}$ have degree $t-1$ in X_2^{-0} and $t \geq 1$ neighbors in $\{x_0', x_0''\}$. If there exists a vertex in X_2^{-0} that is adjacent to both x_1 and x_2, then it is adjacent to both x_0' and x_0''. In particular, such a vertex has degree 0 in $X[X_2^{-0}]$.*

Proof. Notice that any $v \in X_2^{-0}$ must have 20 common neighbors with x_0. First, assume it is not adjacent to x_1 or x_2. Then their common neighbors can only be in $\{x_0', x_0''\}$, say t of them, and in $X_2 \backslash X_2^{-0}$. By double counting 2-paths from v to K_4 we obtain that v has 20 neighbors in X_2. Thus, precisely $t \leq 2$ of them must be in X_2^{-0}.

Second, assume that v is adjacent to exactly one of the x_1, x_2. Then it has $20-1-t$ neighbors in $X_2 \backslash X_2^{-0}$. On the other hand, by double counting, its degree in X_2 is 18. Thus it's degree in X_2^{-0} is $18-(19-t) = t-1$.

Finally, if v is adjacent to x_1 and x_2, it has degree 16 in X_2, thus all his neighbors have to be in $X_2 \backslash X_2^{-0}$ and it also has to be adjacent to both vertices in $\{x_0', x_0''\}$. □

Lemma 9. *Each of the vertices x_0', x_0'' has $19-t$ neighbors in X_2^{-0}, where $t \in \{1, 2\}$ is the number of its neighbors in $\{x_1, x_2\}$. Moreover, x_0' and x_0'' are not adjacent.*

Proof. By double counting 2-paths from x_0' to K_4 we have that x_0 has $31-2t$ neighbors in X_2. Vertices x_0 and x_0' have 12 common neighbors. Let s be equal to 1 if x_0' and x_0'' are adjacent and 0 otherwise. Vertices x_0 and x_0' must have $12-t-s$ common neighbors in X_2, thus x_0' has $31-2t-(12-t-s) = 19-t+s$ neighbors in X_2^{-0}. By symmetry the same holds for x_0'' and since $|X_2^{-0}| = 18$ it would imply that x_0' and x_0'' have at least 16 common neighbors in X_2^{-0}. Thus they are not adjacent and $s = 0$. The lemma holds. □

The above lemmas give enough structure to be able to generate all graphs induced by $K_4 \cup \{x_0, x_0', x_0'', x_1, x_2\} \cup X_2^{-0}$.

Proposition 2. *There are 46 graphs of the form $K_4 \cup \{x_0, x_0', x_0'', x_1, x_2\} \cup X_2^{-0}$ satisfying the structure described in this section.*

3.3 Case $(2, 31, 57, 1)$

Let $X_0 = \{x_0, x_1\}, X_1, X_2, X_3 = \{x_3\}$ be the sets of vertices having $0, 1, 2$, and 3 neighbors in K_4 respectively.

Lemma 10. *We have $x_0 \not\sim x_1$.*

Proof. If $x_0 \sim x_1$ then the number of 2-paths from x_0 to K_4 is at most $3 + 2 \cdot 38 = 79$. But since x_0 is not adjacent to any vertex of K_4, it should have precisely $4 \cdot 20$ 2-paths to it. □

Lemma 11. *$x_0 \sim x_3$ and $x_1 \sim x_3$.*

Proof. Suppose x_0 is not adjacent to x_3 and let N_0, N_1, respectively, be the sets of neighbors of x_0, x_1 in X_2. By double counting 2-paths to K_4 from x_0 and x_1 we have $|N_0| = 40$ while $|N_1| = 40 - 2t$ where $t \in \{0, 1\}$ depending on whether x_1 is adjacent to x_3 or not. Since all the neighbors of x_0 are in X_2, we have $|N_0 \cap N_1| = 20$. But this implies $|N_0 \cup N_1| = 60 - 2t \geq 58$ which is not possible as X_2 has cardinality 57. □

Lemma 12. *Vertices x_0 and x_1 have precisely one neighbor in X_1. In particular, the two neighbors are distinct. Moreover, both x_0 and x_1 have 38 neighbors in X_2, 19 of them in common.*

Proof. Let t be the number of neighbors of x_0 in X_1. By counting 2-paths from x_0 to K_4 we have

$$20 \cdot 4 = 3 + t + 2 \cdot (40 - 1 - t),$$

which gives that $t = 1$, and x_0 has 38 neighbors in X_2. Same holds for x_1. Let again N_0, N_1 be the sets of neighbors of x_0, x_1 in X_2. Then $|N_0 \cup N_1| \leq 57$, thus $|N_0 \cap N_1| \geq 19$. Since x_0 and x_1 have a common neighbor x_3, $|N_0 \cap N_1| = 19$ and $|N_0 \cup N_1| = 57$. In particular this implies that x_0 and x_1 cannot have a common neighbor in X_1. □

The last two lemmas now imply that X_2 can be partitioned into sets $X_2^0, X_2^{\{0,1\}}, X_2^1$ each of cardinality 19 such that every vertex in X_2^i is adjacent to x_i and not adjacent to x_{1-i} for $i = 0, 1$ and every vertex in $X_2^{0,1}$ is adjacent to both x_0 and x_1.

Let us denote the neighbors of x_0, x_1 in X_1 by x_0' and x_1' respectively.

Lemma 13. *If x_3 is adjacent to x_1' then it has 1 neighbor in X_2^0, otherwise it has no neighbor in X_2^0.*

Proof. Vertex x_3 has 12 neighbors in X_2. On the other hand, it must have 12 common neighbors with x_1. Notice that the common neighbors can only be in $X_2 \cup \{x_1'\}$. If x_3 is adjacent to x_1', then it must have 11 neighbors in $X_2^{0,1} \cup X_2^1$, thus 1 in X_2^0. On the other hand, if x_3 is not adjacent to x_1', then it must have all 12 neighbors in $X_2^{0,1} \cup X_2^1$ and no neighbor in X_2^0. □

Lemma 14. *Each vertex in $X[X_2^0]$ has maximal degree 2. If $v \in X_2^0$ has degree 2, then it is not adjacent to x_3, but it is adjacent with x_1'. If it has degree 1, then it is adjacent with ether both x_3 and x_1' or none of them. Finally, if v has degree 0, then it is adjacent to x_3 and not adjacent with x_1.*

Proof. Pick a vertex $v \in X_2^0$ and let $s \in \{0,1\}$ indicate whether v is adjacent with x_1'. Similarly, let $t \in \{0,1\}$ indicate if v it is adjacent with x_3. Let r be the number of neighbors of v in X_2. We count the number of 2-paths from v to K_4:

$$2 \cdot 12 + 2 \cdot 20 = 2 \cdot 3 + 3t + 2r + (40 - 2 - t - r - 1)\,.$$

Thus $r = 21 - 2t$. Vertex v and x_1 must have 20 common neighbors. This implies that the number of neighbors of v in $X_2^{0,1} \cup X_2^1$ is $20 - t - s$. We have that v has $(21 - 2t) - (20 - t - s) = 1 - t + s$ neighbors in X_2^0 which proves our lemma. □

By generating all possible graphs of the form $X_2^0 \cup \{x_0, x_1, x_1', x_3\} \cup K_4$ we infer

Proposition 3. *None of the possible graphs on $X_2^0 \cup \{x_0, x_1, x_1', x_3\} \cup K_4$ interlaces X.*

3.4 Case $(0, 37, 51, 3)$

Let again X_1, X_2 and $X_3 = \{x_0, x_1, x_2\}$ be the respective subsets of vertices of X with 1,2,3 neighbors in K_4. There are three non-isomorphic ways to introduce 3 vertices to K_4 by joining each vertex to 3 vertices of K_4. Each such graph G_1, G_2, G_3 can be uniquely described by a tuple $\vec{n} = (n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4)$ counting the number of edges from the i'th vertex of K_4 to X_3. By relabeling the vertices of K_4 if needed we obtain three tuples $(0,3,3,3), (1,3,3,2)$ and $(2,2,2,3)$ which we will cover as subcases. In what follows we first establish certain structural claims about the configuration $(0, 37, 51, 3)$.

Lemma 15. *The vertices of X_3 form an independent set.*

Proof. No matter how we introduce edges among the vertices of X_3 in the graph $K_4 \cup X_3$ we do not obtain a graph interlacing X. □

Lemma 16. *Every vertex $x \in \{x_0, x_1, x_2\}$ has 27 neighbors in X_1 and 10 neighbors in X_2.*

Proof. Let x have k neighbors in X_1 and $l = 40-3-k$ neighbors in X_2. We count the number of paths of length 2 from x to K_4. We have $3 \cdot 12 + 20 = 3 \cdot 3 + k + 2 \cdot (40 - k - 3)$ and thus $k = 27$ and $l = 10$. □

Let X_2^0, X_2^1, X_2^3 be the neighbors in X_2 of x_0, x_1, x_2 respectively. We have proved that $|X_2^0| = |X_2^1| = |X_2^2| = 10$. Notice that the sets X_2^0, X_2^1, X_2^2 need not be disjoint.

Lemma 17. *It holds $|X_2^0 \cap X_2^1|, |X_2^0 \cap X_2^2|, |X_2^1 \cap X_2^2| \in \{0, 1\}$.*

Proof. Vertices x_0 and x_1 have 20 common neighbors, at least 2 of them are on K_4. Each of x_0, x_1 has 27 neighbors in X_1, where $|X_1| = 37$. Thus they must have at least 17 common neighbors in X_1. The latter implies that they have at most one common neighbor in X_2. By symmetry the claim now holds for $|X_2^0 \cap X_2^2|$ and $|X_2^1 \cap X_2^2|$. □

Lemma 18. *For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ the graph induced by $X_2^0 \setminus X_2^i$ is triangle-free.*

Proof. Assume that there exists a triangle in $X_2^0 \setminus X_2^i$. Together with x_0 it forms a K_4. Assume this K_4 does not extend to a K_5. Vertex x_i is not adjacent to any of the vertices of this K_4. Thus we have a case of K_4 with some vertices that are not adjacent to it. We have already shown that this is not possible. On the other hand, if K_4 extends to a K_5, we have a K_5 and a vertex that is adjacent to at most one vertex on it. This is impossible, since if X has a 5-clique K_5 then using the formula of [4] for K_5, as we did for K_4, gives us that every vertex in $V(X) \setminus K_5$ has precisely two neighbors in K_5. □

Let X_1^{-0} denote the subgraph of X_1 induced on all the vertices not adjacent to x_0 and let X_1^i be the set of vertices in X_1 adjacent to x_i for $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$.

Lemma 19. *The graph X_1^{-0} has 10 vertices. At most one of the vertices in X_1^{-0} is not adjacent to x_1 and at most one is not adjacent to x_2. Moreover, the graph $X_1^{-0} \setminus X_1^i$, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, has no triangles. Each vertex $v \in X_1^{-0}$ has degree k in X_1^{-0} at most 2 and is adjacent to precisely $11 - t - m + k$ vertices in X_2^0, where $t \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ is the number of vertices adjacent to v in*

$\{x_1, x_2\}$ *and* $m \in \{0, 1\}$ *the number of common neighbors of* v *and* x_0 *on* K_4.

Proof. By Lemma 16, $|X_1^0| = 27$, thus $|X_1^{-0}| = 10$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, x_i and x_0 share at least 2 neighbors on K_4. Since they are non-adjacent, they share 20 neighbors, thus at most 18 in X_1. This implies $|X_1^0 \cap X_1^i| \leq 18$, thus $|X_1^0 \cup X_1^i| \geq 27 + 27 - 18 = 36$. Since $|X_1| = 37$ we see that there exist at most one vertex in X_1 that is not adjacent to x_0 and not to x_i.

If there is a triangle in the graph $X_1^{-0} \setminus X_1^i$, this triangle forms a K_4 with x_0, while x_i is not adjacent to any of its vertices. If this 4-clique is not a part of a 5-clique the assertion follows since this case has already been dealt with (a K_4 with some vertices not adjacent to it). On the other hand, if this K_4 is a part of a K_5, we have an induced subgraph of K_5 together with a vertex that is adjacent to one or none of the vertices on K_5. But every vertex in $V(X) \setminus V(K_5)$ has two neighbors in $V(K_5)$ as in Lemma 18. A contradiction. Hence $X_1^{0,2}$ is indeed triangle-free.

Let now $v \in X_1^{-0}$ be as in the lemma. Denote with j the number of its neighbors in X_1. By counting 2-paths to K_4 we get

$$12 + 3 \cdot 20 = 3 + 3t + j + 2(40 - 1 - t - j),$$

hence $j = 9 + t$. Denote with l the number of neighbors of v in X_2^0. Vertex v and x_0 have 20 common neighbors, thus

$$20 = (j - k) + l + m = (9 + t - k) + l + m,$$

from which we get $11 - t - m + k = l \leq 10$. This implies also that $k \leq 2$. □

Lemma 20. *Let* v *be a vertex in* X_2^0 *and* k *the number of its neighbors in* X_2^0, $t \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ *the number of its neighbors in* $\{x_1, x_2\}$, *and* $m \in \{1, 2\}$ *the number of common neighbors of* v *and* x_0 *on* K_4. *Then:*

$$k + m + t \leq 3.$$

In particular $k \leq 2$.

Proof. Let $v \in X_2^0$. Denote with j the number of neighbors of v in X_1. By counting 2-paths from v to K_4 we get:

$$2 \cdot 12 + 2 \cdot 20 = 2 \cdot 3 + 1 \cdot 3 + 3t + j + 2(40 - 2 - 1 - t - j),$$

thus $j = 19 + t$. Let now $l \leq 10$ be the number of neighbors of v in X_1^{-0}. Vertices v and x_0 have 12 common neighbors:

$$12 = k + m + (j - l) = k + m + (19 + t - l),$$

thus $7 + k + m + t = l \leq 10$ and $k + m + t \leq 3$. Since $m \in \{1, 2\}$, $k \leq 2$. □

By generating all graphs induced on $K_4 \cup \{x_0, x_1, x_2\} \cup X_2^0 \cup X_1^{-0}$ we infer.

Proposition 4. *There are* 157 *graphs of the form* $K_4 \cup \{x_0, x_1, x_2\} \cup X_2^0 \cup X_1^{-0}$ *that interlace* X.

The case analysis carried out in this section resulted in 203 graphs, 190 of them having a star complement as an induced subgraph. The remaining 13 had a subgraph of order 19 with no 2 as eigenvalue. Such subgraphs were extended in all possible ways and a final list of 3225 star complements was obtained. By computing the respective comparability graphs and their clique numbers we have determined that none of them has clique number larger than 74. Hence we deduce Proposition 1.

Claim	Program	Output
Lemma 3	K4/134542/Claim1.sage	
Proposition 2	K4/134542/Case1.sage	case13452.g6
Proposition 3	K4/231571/Case2.sage	
Lemma 15	K4/037513/Claim2.sage	
Proposition 4	K4/037513/generateFinal.sage	case037513.g6
Lemma 23	K5/extendTriangle.sage	triangles.g6

Table 1: Sage programs

4 Main result

Let K_5 be a 5-clique of X with vertex set $\{k_1, \ldots, k_5\}$. As already mentioned in Lemma 18, results from [4] imply that every vertex of X that is not in K_5 has precisely two neighbors in K_5. For $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$, let $X_{i,j}$ be vertices in $V(X) \backslash V(K_5)$ that are adjacent to k_i and k_j. Since k_i and k_j are adjacent, they must have 12 common neighbors, 3 of them already on K_5. Hence $V(G) \setminus V(K_5)$ is partitioned into 10 sets of 9 vertices, namely $X_{0,1}, X_{0,2}, \ldots, X_{4,5}$. In what follows we establish structural results about these partitions.

Lemma 21. *For any* $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$ *the graph* $X_{i,j}$ *is either* $\overline{K_9}$ *or* $K_3 \cup \overline{K_6}$ *or* $K_3 \cup K_3 \cup \overline{K_3}$ *or* $K_3 \cup K_3 \cup K_3$.

Proof. Assume there exists an edge $e = \{x, y\}$ in the graph $X_{i,j}$. Then the vertices $\{x, y, k_i, k_j\}$ induce a 4-clique. By the result of the previous section, every 4-clique is contained in a 5-clique. Clearly, the additional vertex must

be in $X_{i,j}$. Hence we have proved that every edge e in $X_{i,j}$ is contained in a triangle in $X_{i,j}$. Let T be a triangle in $X_{i,j}$ and $v \in X_{i,j}$ a vertex not on T. Since $T \cup \{k_i, k_j\}$ induces a 5-clique, every vertex not on this 5-clique is adjacent to exactly 2 vertices on this clique. Since v is adjacent to k_i and k_j, it is not adjacent to T and the lemma follows. □

As it turns out every pair of triangles in distinct partitions $X_{i,j}, X_{k,l}$ induce quite a regular structure.

Lemma 22. *Let $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$, $1 \leq k < l \leq 5$ and let T, T' be two triangles of $X_{i,j}$ and $X_{k,l}$, respectively. Let $c = |\{i, j, k, l\}|$. If $c = 3$, then the edges from T to T' form a perfect matching. If $c = 4$, they form a complement of a perfect matching.*

Proof. First assume $c = 3$. Since $T \cup \{k_i, k_j\}$ forms a 5-clique, every vertex of T' is adjacent to exactly 2 vertices in this 5-clique. Since $c = 3$, it must be adjacent to exactly one vertex in T. Similarly, every vertex of T must be adjacent to exactly one vertex in T'. Thus, the edges from T to T' form a perfect matching. The case when $c = 4$ is similar. □

Our next lemma shows that not all partitions $X_{i,j}$ contain a triangle. In fact at most 7 do.

Lemma 23. *There are at least three distinct pairs $\{i, j\}, \{k, l\}, \{m, n\}$ such that $X_{i,j}, X_{k,l}$ and $X_{m,n}$ are independent sets of X.*

Proof. Using Lemma 22 and Lemma 4 we wrote a Sage program generating all possible graphs on $\{k_1, \ldots, k_5\}$ and 8 triangles, each contained in a different set $X_{i,j}$, for $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$. There are 2 non isomorphic ways to chose 8 sets for triangles (among 10 sets). All the obtained graph in one configuration do not interlace X, while in the other configuration only one graph was found giving rise to 209 comparability graphs. None of them has a clique of order 75. Thus the lemma follows. □

Theorem 1. *The graph X does not exist.*

Proof. With the help of McKay's program *genbg* we generated all graphs of the form $X_{1,2} \cup X_{2,3} \cup K_5$, assuming $X_{1,2}$ and $X_{2,3}$ are independent sets. By constructing star complements from the obtained graphs we obtained a list of 3998479 graphs. By checking the respective comparability graphs it turns out that none of the them has a 75 clique, hence proving our claim. □

5 Final remarks

The presented arguments for the non-existence of a $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ are almost the same as the one used in showing the non-existence of a $(75, 32, 10, 16)$ SRG. What is interesting is that in the case of a $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ SRG the computational aspect is significantly smaller. Indeed it takes only about 2 weeks of CPU time on a standard desktop machine to run the computational parts of the presented result. The two main reasons for this is that the target star complements of $(95, 40, 12, 20)$ have small order (relative to the order of X). Finally, when computing the respective clique numbers it is much easier to prove that the comparability graphs do not have a clique of order 75 as opposed to 56 in the case of a $(75, 32, 10, 16)$ SRG.

References

[1] J. Azarija. *Jazarija github page*. `https://github.com/jazarija/`.

[2] J. Azarija and T. Marc. There is no $(75, 32, 10, 16)$ strongly regular graph. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2015.

[3] M. Behbahani and C. Lam. Strongly regular graphs with non-trivial automorphisms. *Discrete Math.*, 311:132–144, 2011.

[4] A.V. Bondarenko, A. Prymak, and D. Radchenko. Non-existence of $(76, 30, 8, 14)$ strongly regular graph and some structural tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.6748*, 2014.

[5] A. E. Brouwer and J. H. van Lint. Strongly regular graphs and partial geometries. *Enumeration and design (Waterloo, Ont., 1982)*, pages 85–122, 1984.

[6] Andries E. Brouwer and Willem H. Haemers. *Spectra of graphs*. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2012.

[7] A. E. Brower. *Parameters of Strongly Regular Graphs*. `http://www.win.tue.nl/ aeb/graphs/srg/srgtab.html`.

[8] N. Cohen and D. V. Pasechnik. Implementing Brouwer's database of strongly regular graphs. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2016.

[9] D. M. Cvetković, P. Rowlinson, and S. Simic. *Eigenspaces of Graphs*. Number 66. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[10] J. Degraer. *Isomorph-free exhaustive generation algorithms for association schemes*. PhD thesis, Ghent University, 2007.

[11] C. D. Godsil and G. Royle. *Algebraic Graph Theory*, volume 207. Springer New York, 2001.

[12] W. H. Haemers. There exists no $(76, 21, 2, 7)$ strongly regular graph. In *Finite geometry and combinatorics (Deinze, 1992)*, volume 191 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 175–176. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[13] A. A. Makhnev. On strongly regular graphs with parameters $(75, 32, 10, 16)$ and $(95, 40, 12, 20)$. *Fundam. Prikl. Mat.*, 6:179–193, 2000.

[14] M. Milošević. An example of using star complements in classifying strongly regular graphs. *Filomat*, 22:53–57, 2008.